



SPRING 2010

architects

a publication of the california architects board ■ public protection through examination, licensure, and regulation

CAB Recognizes Volunteers

Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Awards

Each year, the Octavius Morgan Distinguished Service Award is bestowed upon those who have significantly contributed to the Board's mission of protecting the health, safety, and welfare of the public through their volunteerism over a period of time. Named after the first president of the Board, the award was given to three architects who have served the Board and their profession in various capacities.

"The award honors each individual's continued commitment and hard work," says former Board President Jon Alan Baker. "We are very thankful for their dedication and service, which is critical to our mission. We rely on the efforts of these highly experienced professionals to help us continually improve testing and maintain the validity of the California Supplemental Examination."

Potential honorees are nominated by Board members and staff annually.

Following are profiles of the 2008 award winners.

Eric Jacobsen

Eric Jacobsen remembers administering an exam for the Board in Monterey and having to drive back to his hometown two hours north to attend a planning hearing—only to turn around

and go back the next day for the rest of the testing. It's that kind of commitment that the Octavius Morgan Award represents.

Jacobsen has been a Board volunteer for 15 years, and master commissioner for 12 years, and has been involved with exam development and item writing for the last 12 years. He says he knows the outcome is worth it—the process blends the talents of a variety of individuals into a collaborative effort with purpose. "I care about my profession and about giving back," he says. "I agree with the protection of health, safety, and welfare of the public—there's a lot to safeguard, and the licensure process enables us to establish minimal compliance for the practice of architecture."

Jacobsen says his interest in architecture started back in high school.



Eric Jacobsen



Bruce Macpherson



Chad Overway

Continued on page 3



President's Message

By Jon Alan Baker, FAIA
Past Board President

Licensure is never easy—I remember taking the Architect Registration Examination (ARE), the California Supplemental Examination (CSE), etc. While the elements are largely the same (except for the Intern Development Program [IDP]), which was adopted in California in 2005, these components are continually improving; however, what appears to some to be progress can be perceived to be problematic to others. The Rolling Clock, Early ARE Eligibility, the Electronic Experience Verification Reporting System (e-EVR), ARE 4.0, IDP 2.0 ... these are but a few of the recent enhancements to our licensing system.

While these changes may appear daunting to candidates, they are all geared toward making licensure more efficient and effective. For example, there was not much opposition to making IDP paperless and few in the profession would dispute the need for the ARE to continue to become more integrative and reflective of contemporary practice.

Despite the advantages of these changes, candidates need to remain vigilant and educate themselves about the programs as well as any changes. If they fail to do so, they can inadvertently add years to their licensure process. It takes work to stay informed and both the Board and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards work very hard to communicate with candidates, but there are always some who are uninformed regarding key changes. I encourage practitioners, educators, interns, students, etc., to share information about such changes.

The Board is committed to redoubling our efforts to ensure that all interested parties are informed about key changes. We all need to take responsibility for communicating any changes for the betterment of the profession.

Keep Your Vital Information Updated

Business and Professions Code (BPC) Section 5558 requires that each person holding a license to practice architecture in California, file with the Board his or her current mailing address, known as the address of record. In addition, the architect must provide the proper and current name and address of the entity or entities through which he or she provides architectural services. This is achieved by completing a "Business Entity Report Form" and sending it to the Board. This information provides the public and the Board with a means to determine if a business providing architectural services does in fact have an architect in responsible control of the services.

If you have changed the business entity you provide architectural services for, or need to add a business entity, please complete a new form and send it to the Board. To download the form, visit www.cab.ca.gov, select the "Licensees" tab, then "Business Entity Form" from the list.

In This Issue Spring 2010

Octavius Morgan Award Winners	1
President's Message.....	2
IDP 2.0.....	4
ARE 4.0.....	6
CSE Format Change.....	8
CSE Preparation Tips	8
Enforcement Actions.....	10

Octavius Morgan Awards

Eric Jacobsen Continued from page 1

"I was fascinated with its artistic side as well as the blending of engineering," he says. "It's like creating sculpture."

He went on to earn a bachelor's degree in architecture from California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo, and he's been principal of Jacobsen & Associates in Half Moon Bay, California, for 27 years.

His firm's projects run the gamut from residential to light commercial to religious facilities, but he says he's taken special pride in designing for the hospitality industry, creating amazing spaces within hotels for many to enjoy.

Bruce Macpherson

Bruce Macpherson's love of drawing and building began at a young age, and has fueled his passion for architecture ever since.

"I'd spend my weekends as a kid with a hammer and nails in the backyard just building," he says. "I liked to see things come together."

Now a principal with Puchlik Design Associates (PDA) in Pasadena, his 25 years of experience encompass projects across the western United States and the United Kingdom, including complex health care environments (PDA's focus), mixed-use projects, multiresidential housing, and a 73,000-square-foot dormitory. In addition, while earning a graduate diploma in housing studies from England's Architectural Association, he completed a master plan as a student project for the redevelopment of London's Royal Victoria Dock.

A strong interest in how cities come together and how physical environment contributes to community building led him to become a planning commissioner for the City of Lancaster, where he was born and raised. "Architects are continually engaged in trying to solve problems, and know that solutions lie in working together in teams of designers and other professionals," which is why their presence is helpful on civic boards,

he says. "Everyone has talents and time they can share, and if you have something to share that can make a difference in your community, you should."

As an accredited professional in Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, he supervises all sustainable building projects for his firm, and has always been a strong believer in conservation and the responsible use of resources. "It just makes good sense," he says.

Macpherson received the Octavius Morgan Award for his continuing work as a California Supplemental Examination (CSE) master commissioner. Having been a volunteer for more than 10 years, he has assisted with standards setting, item writing, job analysis and training other commissioners.

His education includes a bachelor's degree in architecture from California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, and a graduate diploma in housing studies from London's Architectural Association School of Architecture. He is also a member of the adjunct faculty at Antelope Valley College in Lancaster.

Chad Overway

Chad Overway was always interested in drawing. Then he got his first drafting table, and was hooked for good.

"I didn't want to do anything else," he says. He was encouraged to pursue architecture back in high school by one of his favorite drafting teachers.

"I'm glad I took his advice," says Overway, whose work has been featured in numerous exhibits here and abroad. One accomplishment of which he is especially proud is the purchase and renovation of a 1938 San Francisco row house designed by Richard Neutra, one of America's foremost modern architects. "I have been the sole hands-on person involved with the restoration and preservation of the house, which is an honor," he says, "This process has given

me a way to be a steward to modern architecture in terms of recapturing the spirit of Richard Neutra's design in the home."

Overway, now a senior partner with Overway Partners in San Francisco, says he especially loves the problem-solving aspect of architecture. "The more difficult the problem, the more you learn."

A Board volunteer for more than 15 years, he has served as a commissioner and master commissioner for the CSE, and has participated on the item writing, pilot testing, standards setting and commissioner review committees.

"I enjoy the interaction of working with my fellow colleagues to help create a better educational and testing platform," he says. "This creative dialogue keeps us focused on the changes in the profession which in turn helps architects regulate our own professional development. It's important for all architects to share what they've learned and give that back to their community and profession."

He also believes it is important for fellow architects to regulate the licensure process to maintain a high degree of professional standards, which protects the public.

A long-time member of The American Institute of Architects, Overway is also a chartered member of the Royal Institute of British Architects USA and chairs its San Francisco chapter.

His educational background includes a master of architecture from Michigan's Cranbrook Academy of Art; a bachelor's degree in architecture from Southern California Institute of Architecture; and studies at Norway's University of Oslo School of Urban Design and the International Academy of Fine Arts School of Urban Planning in Salzburg, Austria.



IDP 2.0

Commencing July 1, 2009, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) implemented the first of three phases which update the Intern Development Program (IDP) to more closely align with the current practice of architecture. The new IDP requirements were launched as “IDP 2.0” and help ensure that interns acquire the comprehensive training that is essential to competent independent practice. IDP 2.0 is the most significant update of IDP since its inception more than 30 years ago.

The changes to IDP were developed in response to the NCARB 2007 Practice Analysis of Architecture. NCARB invited more than 50,000 architects from across the United States and Canada to participate in the study. Almost 10,000 practicing architects responded by completing the extensive survey to identify the tasks, knowledge, and skills that architects, recently licensed and practicing independently, need. IDP 2.0 offers many benefits to interns by making the reporting experience fundamentally easier, allowing interns to complete training requirements while unemployed, and expanding the definitions of “direct supervision” and “registered architect.” IDP 2.0 is being implemented in three phases over the next two years and there is no transition period. All interns currently participating in IDP are subject to the changes as the phases are implemented.

The first phase of IDP 2.0 which was implemented on July 1, 2009, included these changes:

- » Allowing interns, whether or not employed, to earn training units by completing specific architecture-related certificate programs
- » Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Accreditation—five supplementary education training units
- » Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) Construction Documents Technologist (CDT) —five supplementary education training units
- » CSI Certified Construction Specifier (CCS)—five training units towards minimum required* for Training Area 9, Specifications and Materials Research
- » CSI Certified Construction Contract Administrator (CCCCA)—five training units towards minimum required* for Training Area 12, Construction Phase—Office

- » Allowing interns, whether or not employed, to earn training units by reading the NCARB Professional Conduct monograph and passing the related quiz. A maximum of two training units can be earned toward the minimum required* for Training Area 15, Office Management.
- » Allowing interns who are employed in qualified work settings to earn up to five training units toward the minimum required training units in each training area by completing qualified activities in the Emerging Professional’s Companion 2009 (EPC 2009). Interns can also earn supplementary education training units by completing qualified EPC exercises. The intern’s EPC activities and exercises must be reviewed by their IDP supervisor, and then reported through the e-EVR.
- » Allowing interns, whether or not employed, to earn supplementary education training units by completing AIA-approved continuing education programs. Interns must provide NCARB with an AIA transcript to receive credit.

** Cannot be combined with EPC activities for satisfaction of minimum training units in this area*

The second phase of IDP 2 was implemented on January 4, 2010, and included these changes:

- » Changing the definition of “direct supervision” to more adequately reflect current practice. Under the new definition, IDP supervisors are allowed to supervise their interns through a mix of personal contact and remote communication (e.g., e-mail, online markups, webinars, and Internet) such that “the IDP supervisor has control over the work of the intern and has sufficient professional knowledge of the supervised work so that the IDP supervisor can determine that the intern understands and is performing his or her work experience within the professional standard of care.”

- » Changing the definition of a “registered architect” for the purposes of defining an IDP supervisor to “a person registered to practice architecture in a U.S. or Canadian jurisdiction.” That means that a registered architect will be able to supervise an intern within their office even if they are not registered in the jurisdiction where the firm’s office is located.
- » Allowing interns who have “contract employment” agreements or are “independent contractors” to earn training units if they are working under the direct supervision of a registered architect.
- » Allowing registered architects who have “contract employment” agreements or are “independent contractors” to serve as IDP supervisors if they maintain personal contact with their interns and have authority over their interns’ daily work experience.
- » Changing the IDP Training Requirement from “700 Training Units” to “5,600 Training Hours.” The actual number of hours required to satisfy the IDP Training Requirement will remain the same; however, interns will no longer have to convert the hours they spend in each training area into training units. This should make reporting work experience easier and more accurate.
- » Allowing interns, whether or not they are employed, to earn up to five training units toward the minimum required training units in each training area by completing qualified activities in the EPC 2009. Interns can also earn supplementary education training units by completing qualified EPC exercises. The intern’s EPC activities and exercises must be reviewed by a registered architect who is serving as either their IDP supervisor or IDP mentor, and then reported through the e-EVR.

The third and final phase of IDP 2.0 will be implemented on January 1, 2011.

In this phase, the current IDP training areas will be aligned with the new experience areas required for the competent practice of architecture as identified in the 2007 Practice Analysis of Architecture.



ARE 4.0

Architect Registration Examination (ARE) 4.0 has replaced the previous version ARE 3.1 as the exam candidates must successfully complete to become licensed in the 54 U.S. jurisdictions and Canadian provinces. The final phase of the implementation of ARE 4.0 took place on July 1, 2009, and affects all candidates who are active in the testing process.

ARE 4.0 updates and improves the exam by combining graphic and multiple-choice content and emphasizing the problem-solving skills architects regularly use in everyday practice. ARE 4.0 also improved on ARE 3.1 by reducing the number of divisions to seven and condensing content so candidates can study for a subject all at one time.

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) and the California Architects Board (Board) began notifying candidates of the impending transition as early as the spring of 2007. Over the following two years both NCARB and the Board launched an informational campaign that consisted of news bulletins, newsletter articles, postings on the respective Web sites, and status notification and informational mailings to candidates. Candidates who were unable to complete all divisions of ARE 3.1 by the June 30, 2009, deadline have had their

examination scores transitioned based on the NCARB Transition Chart. The Transition Chart is available on the NCARB Web site (www.ncarb.org). In some cases, the transition may result in some candidates having to retest on content previously passed under ARE 3.1. Throughout all versions of the ARE the goal of the exam has remained the same: to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public by providing a psychometrically justifiable and legally defensible exam that measures the level of competency necessary to independently practice architecture.

The Board has received numerous questions about the final implementation of ARE 4.0. Following are some of the most common questions and answers:

Q. Why did NCARB decide to update the ARE?

A. NCARB conducted a comprehensive Practice Analysis in 2001 to study how the exam testing process relates to the practice of architecture. Based on a survey of more than 50,000 practicing architects, NCARB determined that improvements were necessary for the ARE to properly reflect the way modern architecture is practiced.

Q. How were candidates notified?

A. The Board and NCARB gave candidates approximately two years notice of the impending transition. This notice took many forms including information on the respective Web sites, informational mailings, newsletter articles, and presentations at The American Institute of Architects' chapter meetings.



Q. I was unable to finish testing under ARE 3.1 and now I need to re-take some of the content I previously passed. Why?

A. The rules of the ARE 4.0 Transition required candidates to complete specific divisions under ARE 3.1 to receive credit for the corresponding ARE 4.0 divisions. In most cases, more than one ARE 3.1 division was required to receive the corresponding ARE 4.0 credit. If candidates did not complete all of the required ARE 3.1 divisions they are required to complete the relevant divisions in ARE 4.0. For instance, to receive credit for "Programming, Planning, and Practice" (PPP), ARE 4.0 requires a candidate to complete "Pre-Design and Site Planning" under ARE 3.1. Failure to complete either ARE 3.1 division results in the candidate being required to complete PPP under ARE 4.0. One significant division under ARE 3.1 was "Building Technology" (BT). Failure to successfully complete BT results in a candidate being required to complete four divisions under ARE 4.0.

Q. I didn't successfully complete BT and now I have four divisions under ARE 4.0 to complete. Can I appeal my BT result?

A. No. California does not allow candidates taking the ARE to review or appeal their examination results. Furthermore, NCARB does not permit appeals of graphical vignettes.

Q. Can I continue to take ARE 3.1 since I started testing in that version?

A. No. There are no jurisdictions in which a candidate can take an ARE 3.1 division.

Q. Can I appeal the ARE 4.0 Transition?

A. No. NCARB is not allowing candidates to appeal the ARE 4.0 Transition. It is the only version of the ARE being administered and candidates seeking licensure in U.S. jurisdictions must successfully complete it to receive a license.

Q. I took and successfully completed seven of the ARE 3.1 divisions many years ago. I became an inactive candidate and now I would like to continue testing. Will I lose credit for my previously passed divisions?

A. Inactive candidates that return to testing will be transitioned in accordance to the ARE 4.0 Transition rules. Consequently, returning candidates may lose credit for some or possibly all divisions they previously passed depending on which specific divisions they were able to successfully complete. Please refer to the ARE Reverse Transition Chart (available on the NCARB Web site) to determine which divisions you will receive credit for (if any) under ARE 4.0.

California Supplemental Examination

Format Change

At its September, 2009, meeting, the California Architects Board (Board) unanimously voted to transition the California Supplemental Examination from an oral format to a written format. This vote occurred as a result of an examination format study which analyzed format options for the CSE and recommended a multiple-choice format. This format change would increase defensibility, maintain examination integrity, expand capacity to serve candidates, and preserve the Board's resources.

The CSE format study was the result of a Joint Legislative Sunset Review Committee (JLSRC) recommendation which asked the Board to assess if a written examination was feasible and report the findings to the JLSRC. In 2007, the Board approved a recommendation for staff to move forward with contracting with an outside consultant to complete an objective study of the oral CSE format and other possible options.

In early 2009, the consultant began work on the study. The results and recommendation were then taken to the Board's Examination Committee in September 2009 and approved, which subsequently resulted in the full Board's approval later that month.

The written examination is currently being developed and once completed, will be administered at 13 computerized test centers throughout California, as well as 10 additional sites located throughout the United States. The computerized testing centers will be available for testing six days a week and during normal working hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Again, this will expand the Board's capacity to serve candidates by expediting the CSE process and allowing much more flexibility with scheduling.

Preparation Tips

The California Supplemental Examination is currently a structured oral examination administered by the California Architects Board (Board) and is the final step to licensure in California. Candidates become eligible for the CSE after completing the Architect Registration Examination (ARE), verifying eight years of education and/or experience, and, if applicable, completing the Intern Development Program (IDP) and Comprehensive Intern Development Program (CIDP). The CSE takes a scenario project through a natural course of development and includes graphic and written documents that candidates have the opportunity to review prior to and during the examination. The project description and graphics provide a focus for the examination questions and establish a context for candidate responses.

During the examination, candidates are given the opportunity to demonstrate through oral responses their overall understanding of architectural practice. Three architect commissioners grade the

candidate's overall understanding of the practice by asking the candidate predetermined questions. Candidates are required to demonstrate at least entry-level competence in the areas outlined in the Test Plan. The CSE lasts approximately 1.5 hours.

The Board recommends the following preparation tips for the CSE:

Read the Candidate Study Guide. The Study Guide contains valuable information on examination procedures, administrative processes, scoring and reporting, and a sample project scenario with sample questions and elements of competent responses. Candidates should take time to read all the material and contact the Board well in advance of the test date if he/she has questions.

Study the Test Plan. The Test Plan is based on the results of a statewide survey of practicing California architects. The intent of the Test Plan is to focus on California-specific aspects of practice, and not duplicate coverage of general areas of practice covered by the ARE. It is therefore neither comprehensive nor representative of the full scope of architectural practice. The Test Plan is in Appendix A of the Candidate Study Guide. The Test Plan is used by the Board to develop the examination questions. No questions will be asked that are not based upon the material found in the Test Plan. Candidates may find it helpful to compare their experiences and knowledge with each area of the Test Plan.

Practice Oral Responses. Again, candidates should think about their own experiences and knowledge with each area of the Test Plan and practice responding orally to questions about the content.

Use the Reference Materials. The Board provides a comprehensive list of reference materials on its Web site at www.cab.ca.gov by clicking on the CSE link under the "Candidates" tab.

Candidates are expected to show that they can apply conceptual knowledge of those resources as they relate to specific practice-based scenarios. Candidates should therefore take a holistic approach in their studies with the goal of understanding concepts and processes. The CSE is not a quiz on discrete elements (i.e., specific "chapter and verse") of the documents.

Engage in Self-Directed Study. For areas of the Test Plan for which the candidates have limited knowledge or experience, they should engage in self-directed study (e.g., Comprehensive Intern Development Program training areas, continuing education, The American Institute of Architects, The Architect's Handbook of Professional Practice, Emerging Professional's Companion, etc.).

Do Your Own Research. The Board encourages you to do your own research on the content of the examination based upon the Test Plan. Developing your own knowledge, based upon your education, research and experience will serve you better than cramming.

Beware of Examination Seminars or Study Guides. The Candidate Study Guide, published by the Board, is the only official examination preparation publication for the CSE. The Board does not contribute to nor endorse any other examination preparation seminars or study guides for the CSE. The Board's examination commissioners may not contribute to or participate in any

preparation seminars or study guides. In addition, individuals and organizations that offer examination preparation seminars or study guides are not given any information beyond what is available in the Candidate Study Guide. If candidates do attend seminars, use caution with those that supply questions and answers. The CSE may have similar questions with different competent answers.

Understand the Format of the Oral Examination. The CSE is not like most other examinations and understanding the testing environment (e.g., the panel, the format), process, and protocol will be helpful.

Be Prepared Prior to Arriving at the Examination Site. Candidates should carefully review the materials the Board has provided for what to bring and what not to bring to the examination site, as outlined in the Candidate Study Guide. Candidates should also plan to arrive at the site at least 30 minutes prior to the optional review period to allow sufficient time for signing in for the examination.

Relax. The Board, the commissioners, and the proctors understand the importance of the examination to you and are sensitive to the stress associated with the process. During the examination, focus on the question and use your own experience and knowledge to demonstrate your understanding of the concept or process raised by the question.





Enforcement Actions

CAB is responsible for receiving and investigating complaints against licensees and unlicensed persons. CAB also retains the authority to make final decisions on all enforcement actions taken against its licensees. Included below is a brief description of recent enforcement actions taken by CAB against individuals who were found to be in violation of the Architects Practice Act.

Every effort is made to ensure the following information is correct. Before making any decision based upon this information, you should contact CAB. Further information on specific violations may also be obtained by contacting the Board's Enforcement Unit at 916.575.7208.

ADMINISTRATIVE CITATIONS

ALLEN ADEL (Woodland Hills)

The Board issued a two-count administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Allen Adel, an unlicensed individual, dba Lorient & Associates, for alleged violations of Business and Professions Code (BPC) Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out As Architect). The action alleged that Adel executed a written agreement to provide "Architectural Design" for the construction of a small parking garage. The project is not a building described in BPC Section 5537(a) as an exempt building. The citation became final on May 12, 2009.

NICHOLAS S. AGBABIKA (Redwood City)

The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Nicholas S. Agbabiaka, an unlicensed individual, dba Environmental Pro-Tech Enterprises Consolidated, Inc., for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Agbabiaka executed a written proposal to provide "Architectural" services to remodel an existing commercial building in Oakland, California. The letterhead on the proposal under Agbabiaka's company name included the word "Architecture." The proposal also identified Agbabiaka's company as an "Architect" firm. The citation became final on February 17, 2009.

BENJAMIN B. AGUILAR (Riverside)

The Board issued a two-count administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Benjamin B. Aguilar, an unlicensed individual, dba Aguilar Design Group, for alleged violations of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Aguilar executed a written agreement to provide professional

"Architectural Design" services for two office buildings. The projects are not buildings described in BPC Section 5537(a) as exempt buildings. The citation became final on September 8, 2009.

AMIR I. AMIRFAR (Irvine) The Board issued a two-count administrative citation that included a \$5,000 civil penalty to Amir I. Amirfar, an unlicensed individual, dba Amir Amirfar & Associates, Inc., for alleged violations of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Amirfar's Web site offered "Architectural Services" and stated that "the design team is made up of Architects, Structural Engineers, Mechanical/Electrical; Plumbing Engineers, Quality Control Engineers, Landscape Architects and Construction Management staff." The action also alleged that Amirfar was listed in a service provider directory under a listing titled "Architects" which stated that he offered "Architectural Design." The citation became final on January 13, 2009.

JON ARMENDARIZ (San Diego) The Board issued a two-count administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Jon Armendariz, an unlicensed individual, dba Armendariz Design Group, for alleged violations of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Armendariz entered into a contract to provide a "Complete set of plans from County stamped of approval for construction of prefabricated log cabin" located in Pine Valley, California. A log cabin is not a project type that satisfies the definition of an exempt project type described in BPC Section 5537(a). Armendariz entered into an addendum to the above contract to provide "Architectural drafting changes to cabin and garage." The citation became final on December 17, 2008.

GINGER ATHERTON (Bel Air)

The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$2,500 civil penalty to Ginger Atherton, an unlicensed individual, dba Ginger Atherton & Associates, for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Atherton had an advertisement in the September/October 2008 issue of the Haute Living Magazine that identified her company, Ginger Atherton & Associates, as an "Architectural" firm. The citation became final on September 9, 2009.

CHARLES I. BLAUGRUND (Moorpark)

The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$250 civil penalty to Charles I. Blaugrund, architect license number C-25792, for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5584 (Negligence). The action alleged that Blaugrund entered into a contract to provide architectural services for the completion of design and construction documents for a new residence located in Chatsworth, California. Blaugrund failed to provide specific information on the documents necessary for a contractor to completely bid the project. Blaugrund paid the civil penalty, satisfying the citation. The citation became final on February 2, 2009.

TONY P. CHUNAPONGSE (Panorama City)

The Board issued a two-count administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Tony P. Chunapongse, an unlicensed individual, dba CCAD Designs, for alleged violations of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged Chunapongse disseminated his business cards to potential clients that included the title "Architectural Designer" under his name. In addition, Chunapongse executed an agreement offering to provide "Architectural" drafting services for a

commercial tenant improvement project located in Long Beach, California, and billed his client for "Architectural" designs. Chunapongse signed an addendum agreement with his client and a contractor for work to be performed on the project. In the addendum agreement, Chunapongse signed his name under the title "Architect." Chunapongse paid the civil penalty, satisfying the citation. The citation became final on June 1, 2009.

FRANCISCO X. COBIAN

(Santa Barbara) The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Francisco X. Cobian, an unlicensed individual, dba Home Designs, for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Cobian executed a contract to remodel an existing residence in Ventura, California. The contract identified Cobian as a "Register Architectural Designer #93-HO-005." The contract stated that Cobian would perform professional "Architectural Design" and "Architectural Details Drafting." The citation became final on December 12, 2008.

ANINDY A. GHOSH (India) The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$2,500 civil penalty to Anindy A. Ghosh, an unlicensed individual, dba Atecture, for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Ghosh's Web site advertised that his firm provides "Architectural Planning and Design" services and listed projects completed in California with a California contact telephone number. The projects are not buildings described in BPC Section 5537(a) as exempt buildings. The citation became final on March 2, 2009.

KENNETH F. IBARRA (San Bruno) The Board issued a two-count administrative citation that included a \$2,000 civil penalty to Kenneth F. Ibarra, architect license number C-15478, for alleged violations of BPC Section 5584 (Willful Misconduct) and California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 160(b)(2) (Rules of Professional Conduct). The action alleged that Ibarra entered into a written contract to provide architectural and engineering services for the remodel and addition to a two-story residence located in San Bruno, California. The contract stated that Ibarra's services would be performed as expeditiously as is consistent with professional skill and care and the orderly

progress of the work. The contract further stated that based on a mutually agreed-upon program and schedule, Ibarra would prepare, for approval by the owner, design documents consisting of drawings and other documents appropriate for the project and make necessary corrections and/or clarifications to the documents, as a result of the Building Department's plan review process, in order to procure building permit approval. Ibarra submitted the initial set of construction documents without truss calculations to the City of San Bruno Building Department for Plan Check. The Building Official sent review comments to Ibarra. Ibarra resubmitted the design package to the City of San Bruno without truss calculations for a second time. It took approximately 14 months to develop the documents for the initial submittal to the City of San Bruno for Plan Check, which is a significant amount of time for development of a small addition/remodel project. Ibarra failed to meet the industry basic standard of care by not preparing construction documents in a timely manner and delaying the plan approval process by not providing truss calculations. In addition, the Board mailed letters to Ibarra's address of record requesting information regarding the above allegations; however, the Board never received a response from Ibarra. The citation became final on August 31, 2009.

ROLANDO INTERVALO (La Quinta) The Board issued a three-count administrative citation that included a \$7,500 civil penalty to Rolando Intervalo, an unlicensed individual, dba Jamros Design, for alleged violations of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Intervalo's company was listed under the "Architects" heading on several Internet directories. In addition, Intervalo's company was listed under the "Architects" heading in the 2007 Desert Gay Yellow Pages telephone directory. Respondent's Web site also stated that he "began as a practicing architect in 1973." Intervalo also prepared plans which contained a title block that stated "JAMROS ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES." The citation became final on March 12, 2009.

JONATHAN JANG (Redwood City) The Board issued a two-count administrative citation that included a \$2,000 civil penalty to Jonathan Jang, architect license number C-14335, for alleged violations of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self

Out as Architect) and CCR Section 104 (Filing of Addresses). The action alleged that while Jang's license was expired, his Web site, "www.jonjangarchitect.com," advertised "We are a residential architecture firm specializing in all aspects of new and remodeled houses." Jang's license expired on March 31, 2005 and was not renewed until July 23, 2008. In addition, Jang failed to notify the Board of his change of address. The citation became final on March 25, 2009.

STEPHEN K.C. LAM (El

Monte) The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to Stephen K.C. Lam, architect license number C-10002, for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5536.22(a) (Written Contract). The action alleged that Lam failed to execute a written contract for providing conceptual studies, design plans, and CAD drafting services for a 52-unit condominium in Temple City, California. Lam paid the civil penalty, satisfying the citation. The citation became final on February 18, 2009.

MILTIADES MANDROS

(Oakland) The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$1,000 civil penalty to Miltiades Mandros, an unlicensed individual for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Mandros submitted plans to the City of Hayward, Building Division for a residence. The title block on the plans stated "Almost Architecture," "Miltiades Mandros," and "Design Studio." The citation became final on April 3, 2009.

MATHEW MCGRANE (Santa Ana) The Board issued a one-count citation that included a \$2,500 civil penalty to Mathew McGrane, an unlicensed individual, dba McGrane Design, for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that McGrane's Web site, www.mcgranedesign.com advertised that he provides "architectural design services." The Web site included a listing of projects and stated that McGrane Design is the "Production Architect," the "Design Architect" or the "Architect/Design" on these projects. The citation became final on September 9, 2009.

HARRISON NGUYEN

(San Jose) The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$2,500 civil penalty to Harrison Nguyen, an unlicensed individual, dba Architectural Design, for an alleged violation of BPC

Continued on back page

Enforcement Actions

Continued from page 11

Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Nguyen signed a proposal offering to provide "architectural design services" for a tenant improvement project (coffee shop) in San Jose, California. The letterhead on the proposal included Nguyen's business name "Architectural Design." The citation became final on June 8, 2009.

ALLAN NICHOL (Mill Valley)

The Board issued a two-count administrative citation that included a \$2,000 civil penalty to Allan Nichol, architect license number C-10249, for alleged violations of BPC Section 5536.22(a) (Written Contract) and CCR Section 160(f) (Rules of Professional Conduct). The action alleged that Nichol executed an agreement to provide architectural services for drawings to obtain planning and building approval and construction permit for a residential remodel and addition project, in Mill Valley, California. Nichol failed to include his architect license number and the description of the procedure to accommodate additional services in his contract and he failed to obtain the clients' consent in writing to proceed with the added scope of work and their authorization to incur additional fees. The citation became final on February 10, 2009.

MEHDI RAFATY

(West Hollywood) The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$2,500 civil penalty to Mehdi

Rafaty, an unlicensed individual, dba Tag Front, for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Rafaty's Web site, "www.Tagfront.com," stated that he provides "Architecture" and that "Mehdi and Mandi Rafaty, Tag Front, is an award winning architectural and design team." The Web site also stated that "Tag Front provides an array of creative services including architecture, interiors..." and "Our experience lends itself to providing creative solutions to any architectural and design challenges with any project." The citation became final on September 9, 2009.

JOHN SWEARINGEN

(Berkeley) The Board issued a three-count administrative citation that included a \$3,500 civil penalty to John Swearingen, an unlicensed individual, dba Skillful Means, for alleged violations of BPC Sections 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect) and 5536.1(c) (Signature and Stamp on Plans and Documents; Unauthorized Practice). The action alleged that Swearingen sent a "Consult Letter" via e-mail to his clients offering design consultation to develop plans for their residence in Salyer, California. The Consult Letter included fee descriptions for "Architects and Principals" and "Junior Architect." Swearingen also sent a letter to the client via email that offered to provide "architectural services." Swearingen also prepared architectural drawings for a residence consisting of straw bale walls,

and combination wood post and beam and steel framing system construction, which is not a project described in BPC Section 5537(a) as an exempt building. In addition, Swearingen's firm's Web site stated that "Chris Andrews" and "Janet Johnston" are architects on staff. Board records reveal that Andrews and Johnston are not working for Swearingen's firm. The citation became final on January 15, 2009.

DAVID UENAKA (Roseville)

The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$2,500 civil penalty to David Uenaka, an unlicensed individual, dba TC Electric Co., for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5536(b) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that Uenaka signed and sealed a sheet of plans for a project in Sacramento, California. The seal included Uenaka's business name, and the words "State of California." The citation became final on March 2, 2009.

DAVID WHITE (Carlsbad)

The Board issued a one-count administrative citation that included a \$500 civil penalty to David White, an unlicensed individual, dba Atlantis Company, for an alleged violation of BPC Section 5536(a) (Practice Without License or Holding Self Out as Architect). The action alleged that White entered into a contract to remodel an existing residence in Encinitas, California. The contract identified White's company as an "Architect." The citation became final on February 17, 2009.

CALIFORNIA

architects

California Architects Board
2420 Del Paso Road, Suite 105
Sacramento, CA 95834

Board Members

Iris Cochlan, President, Public Member
Pasqual Gutierrez, Vice President, Architect Member
Marilyn Lyon, Secretary, Public Member
Jon Alan Baker, Architect Member
Larry Guidi, Public Member
Jeffrey D. Heller, Architect Member
Michael Merino, Architect Member
Sheran Voigt, Public Member
Hraztan Zeitlian, Architect Member

Douglas R. McCauley, Executive Officer

To Get In Touch With Us

California Architects Board
Tel 916.574.7220 • Fax 916.575.7284
cab@dca.ca.gov • www.cab.ca.gov